

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 10, 2006 and the communication dated February 12, 2007 have been received and the contents carefully reviewed. This Supplemental Amendment replaces the Amendment filed on October 10, 2006

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 9 are hereby amended and claims 12-14 are newly added. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to claim 6 for informalities noted therein. The Applicants have corrected claim 6 accordingly, and ask the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking the time to speak with the Applicant's Representatives on July 13, 2006. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Remarks and constitutes a record of the interview. During the interview, the Examiner explained that, given a broad and reasonable interpretation, the Applicant's Prior Art Admission was considered to anticipate "an aesthetic member covering the installation hole, wherein a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a joint formed by welding, wherein a front side of said aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of the cabinet cover body by an adhesive agent."

**The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's Prior Art Admission (hereinafter "APAA").** The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that APAA does not teach every element recited in claims 1-6 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a cabinet cover which includes, among other features, "a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to

the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a weld joint formed at the peripheral edge of the aesthetic member, and the front side surface of said aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of the cabinet cover body by an adhesive agent.” APAA fails to disclose at least these features.

What the APAA actually teaches is that the aesthetic member is attached to the cabinet by spot welding around front side of the installation hole in the cabinet. In addition, in the APAA, adhesive is applied to the edge of the aesthetic member. Therefore, APAA does not teach “a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a weld joint formed at the peripheral edge of the aesthetic member, and the front side surface of said aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of the cabinet cover body by an adhesive agent.”

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over APAA, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reasons

**The Office Action rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APAA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,018,131 to *Snider* (hereinafter “*Snider*”).** The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicants submit that neither APAA nor *Snider* either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1-11.

Regarding claims 1-6, claim 1 has been amended to recite a cabinet cover which includes, among other features, “a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a weld joint formed at the peripheral edge of the aesthetic member.” Neither of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose these features.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action at page 4, APAA does not disclose “a joint disposed about a peripheral edge of the member formed by welding.” *Snider* is introduced

to overcome the deficiencies of APAA, specifically to teach “that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an array of attaching means/methods for attaching a member to a body.” While *Snider* may teach attaching means using adhesive and welding, they are used in separate applications. *Snider* fails to teach or fairly suggest using both adhesive and welding means in a single application. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify APAA in view of *Snider*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 is patentably distinguishable over APAA in view of *Snider* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above

Regarding claims 7 and 8, claim 7 has been amended to recite “the aesthetic member being attached to the rear of the cabinet cover body with an adhesive agent and a weld joint formed about a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member.” Neither of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose these features.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action at page 4, APAA does not disclose “a joint disposed about a peripheral edge of the member formed by welding.” *Snider* is introduced to overcome the deficiencies of APAA, specifically to teach “that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an array of attaching means/methods for attaching a member to a body.” While *Snider* may teach attaching means using adhesive and welding, they are used in separate applications. *Snider* fails to teach or fairly suggest using both adhesive and welding means in a single application. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify APAA in view of *Snider*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 is patentably distinguishable over APAA in view of *Snider* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 8, which depends from claim 7 is also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 has been amended to recite an “said aesthetic member is welded to the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a weld joint at a peripheral edge of said aesthetic member” Neither of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose these features.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action at page 4, APAA does not disclose “a joint disposed about a peripheral edge of the member formed by welding.” *Snider* is introduced to overcome the deficiencies of APAA, specifically to teach “that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an array of attaching means/methods for attaching a member to a body.” While *Snider* may teach attaching means using adhesive and welding, they are used in separate applications. *Snider* fails to teach or fairly suggest using both adhesive and welding means in a single application. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify APAA in view of *Snider*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 is patentably distinguishable over APAA in view of *Snider* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 10-11, which depend from claim 9 are also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above.

Newly added claims 12-14 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on the allowable claims 1, 7 and 9.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Amdt. dated March 6, 2007

Reply to Non Final Office Action dated February 12, 2007

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael J. Chayet (Reg. No. 46,522)  
*for* **Mark R. Kresloff**  
Registration No.: 42,766  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant